

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

JAMES C. KELLEY,

Plaintiff,

v.

DR. KAREN GEDNEY, *et. al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:16-cv-00041-MMD-WGC

ORDER REGARDING REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION OF
MAGISTRATE JUDGE
WILLIAM G. COBB

Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge William G. Cobb (ECF No. 42), recommending the granting of Defendant John Peery's Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 33). Plaintiff had until June 19, 2017, to file an objection. (ECF No. 42.) To date, no objection to the R&R has been filed¹.

This Court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party timely objects to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, then the court is required to "make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the [report and recommendation] to which objection is made." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party fails to object, however, the court is not required to conduct "any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection." *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a magistrate judge's report and recommendation where no objections have been filed. See

¹Plaintiff did not respond to Peery's motion, and had suggested that Peery is not a proper defendant. (ECF No. 35.)


1 *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2003) (disregarding the standard
2 of review employed by the district court when reviewing a report and recommendation to
3 which no objections were made); *see also Schmidt v. Johnstone*, 263 F. Supp. 2d 1219,
4 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003) (reading the Ninth Circuit's decision in *Reyna-Tapia* as adopting the
5 view that district courts are not required to review "any issue that is not the subject of an
6 objection."). Thus, if there is no objection to a magistrate judge's recommendation, then
7 the court may accept the recommendation without review. *See, e.g., Johnstone*, 263 F.
8 Supp. 2d at 1226 (accepting, without review, a magistrate judge's recommendation to
9 which no objection was filed).

10 Nevertheless, this Court finds it appropriate to engage in a *de novo* review to
11 determine whether to adopt Magistrate Judge Cobb's R&R. Having reviewed Defendant
12 Peery's Motion for Summary Judgment and the R&R, the Court agrees with the
13 Magistrate Judge's recommendation and will adopt it.

14 It is therefore ordered, adjudged and decreed that the Report and
15 Recommendation of Magistrate Judge William G. Cobb (ECF No. 42) is accepted and
16 adopted in full.

17 It is further ordered that Defendant Peery's Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF
18 No. 33) is granted.

19 DATED THIS 14th day of August 2017.

20
21 
22 _____
23 MIRANDA M. DU
24 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
25
26
27
28